DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 153 279 CS 502 051

AUTHOR Darsey, James
TITLE "Gayspeak": The Generic/Idiosyncratic Distinction and the Creation of an Academic Fairytale.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 22p.; Study prepared at the University of Wisconsin

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavioral Science Research; *Homosexuality; *Intellectual Disciplines; *Minority Groups; *Nonverbal Communication; *Research Needs; *Verbal Communication

ABSTRACT

Idiosyncratic studies illuminate the unique characteristics of a phenomenon, while generic studies create general statements based on the conformity of many phenomena. This document explicates Joseph Hayes' article, "Gayspeak," in terms of this distinction and seeks to define gay studies as a legitimate academic discipline. The way in which Hayes describes three social contexts of a Gayspeak--the secret, the social, and the radical-activist is analyzed with regard to its reflection of generic principles. The idiosyncratic approach--isolation and study of those traits that are unique to gay people--is recommended in order to help make gay studies into a coherent academic area. The document concludes with a discussion of questions and problems that could give direction to further research. (CC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James Darsey

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

James Darsey
Department of Communication Arts
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Madison, WI 53706

ED153279

"Gayspeak": The Generic\Idiosyncratic Distinction and the Creation of an Academic Fairytale

> Of course the first thing to do was to make a grand survey of the country she was going to travel through. "It's something very like learning geography," thought Alice as she stood on tiptoe in hopes of being able to see a little further.
>
> Lewis Carrcll
>
> Through the Looking Glass

No one would enjoy having to play chess from the perspective of one of the pieces. The player who has an overview of the entire board has a tremendous advantage. Yet, we relinquish that advantage constantly in our academic work and go rushing around the board like figments of Lewis Carroll's imagination. In large part, we give up any broader horizon than that of the pawn through strict departmental insulation. Inbreeding simply perpetuates itself without correction. It is only when scholars in one field hold up their work for examination by scholars in another that larger perspectives can be achieved and serendipity can be traded for system.

The Gay Academic Union Journal is one vehicle aiming at this goal. Last year, Joseph Hayes also performed such a cross-disciplinary function for gay studies through the publication of "Gayspeak" in The Quarterly Journal of Speech.[1] Professor Hayes is a linguist, and he has presented his work to a field concerned with rhetoric and theories of communication. To achieve its

CS502051

potential benefit, such a presentation must be followed by an exchange between the fields involved. As a student of rhetorical theory with an interest in gay rhetoric, I hope to initiate such an exchange with this paper.

Such an exchange of views can be expected to do three things. First, it can lend a broader view in correcting misconceptions created from lack of data. Sometimes looking at the problem from the angle of a new body of literature and knowledge illuminates facets which are more generalizable, have greater explanatory power, or are more useful tools for investigation. Second, an exchange should be additive so that the knowledge of combined fields contributes greater depth to ideas. Third, and most important, an exchange should lift us off the academic playing board in a synergetic way so that we can better see profitable directions for future research. If such a discussion of "Gayspeak," from the perspective of one in speech, can help to make such a contribution, then it shall have been well worthwhile.

But this essay also attempts to perform a fourth function — to provide some direction for defining "gay studies." The very existence of the Gay Academic Union and Gai Saber represent a claim that we as gay scholars are engaged in creating a new and unique field of study deserving of special treatment outside the bounds of more traditionally limited disciplines. In this paper I shall argue for a generic/idiosyncratic distinction which may provide some direction as to where we, as pioneers, may begin to look for materials which are exclusively the domain of gay studies and may thus begin to define ourselves. Although this essay is framed around the specific content of language and communication (which is in itself quite broad) the implications are much broader.

Joseph Hayes and the Nature of Gayspeak[2]

Mr. Hayes deals with the "social functions of language" in the gay subculture. Within his scope, he includes "lexicon, usage, imagery, and rhetoric" all under the rubric of "Gayspeak."[3]

To facilitate analysis, Hayes divides Gayspeak into three social contexts — the secret, the social, and the radical-activist settings. Hayes outlines the role of Gayspeak in each of these settings as follows: In the secret setting, the function of Gayspeak is to identify other gay people without jeopardizing one's own identity. Secret setting Gayspeak also serves to evade the inquiries of others concerning one's identity and specific relationships. Social setting Gayspeak, in contrast, is flamboyant, demonstrative, and unconcerned with issues of passing or determining whether or not others present are members of the gay community. It is this setting which has been most shaped by and has most shaped societal stereotypes of gay people. Social setting Gayspeak is shunned in both the secret and the radical-activist settings — in the secret setting because it is a threat and in the radical-activist setting because it is philosophically repugnant. The radical-activist setting is largely a political state of mind resulting in a Gayspeak which is "often indistinguishable from the rhetoric of the general counterculture."[4]

"Gayspeak" and Gay Studies: An Examination of Purpose

Scholars, of whatever discipline, are governed by one overriding concern - to represent their object of study accurately. In a world where the idea of Platonic forms is largely outmoded, the criteria for accuracy may be somewhat ambiguous, but there is a general, if unexplicated, understanding

that the accurate presentation is the one which lends valuable and plausible insights, has the greatest explanatory potential, or, for some, lends itself to prediction and control.

In the study of complex phenomena, accuracy depends not only on the proper representation of the component parts, but on the application of the proper generalization to those parts. A classic case of where the wrong generalization was applied to well-documented particulars was some of the earlier studies on the behavior of blacks. Many of those studies, dealing with crime, juvenile delinquency, educational drop-out rates, etc., were not inaccurate in themselves but only in their application of the generalization that the phenomenon was a black problem rather than what has subsequently been demonstrated to be the more useful conception that certain of these problems are not racial but socioeconomic. The repercussions of such faulty generalization should be obvious.

Applied to Hayes' article, this line of reasoning reveals most obviously the infant state of gay studies. The parameters in gay studies have not been well-enough defined to distinguish between the generic and the idiosyncratic. Scholarly endeavors which I shall call generic are those which are concerned with broad, generalizable classes of phenomena. Scholarship which I shall call idiosyncratic, on the other hand, is devoted to establishing and understanding the unique characteristics of an event, person, or group. A study which demonstrates the unique effects that being black has upon behavior is idiosyncratic. In contrast, a study which uses a black ghetto population as an example of the effects of lower socioeconomic status on behavior is generic.

Members of a group such as the gay caucus of the Modern Language Associa-

tion or the Gay Academic Union presumably have as a central concern the development of an idiosyncratic area of study — in this case, issues of behavior in the gay community from a perspective which seeks to gain knowledge about the gay community as an employer of specific behaviors (eg. language) rather than a perspective which seeks to make generalizations about the behaviors themselves. If this were not so, there would be no need for the academic activities of such a caucus or union; they could be reduced to political bodies. The academic activities exist because there is a belief in the validity of a distinctive area of gay studies. By contrast, studies such as the one I presented to the Central States Speech Association last spring, are generic.[5] That study, which involved the rhetoric of Mattachine Midwest from 1967 to 1970, had as its primary purpose the illumination of characteristics of agitative rhetoric. The fact that gay rhetoric was used for data was incidental. To build a coherent area of gay studies, the idiosyncratic approach to gay data, those traits which are unique to gay people must be isolated, and then their impact on various phenomena such as language usage, must be studied. Unfortunately, at the present time, we often lack the basic knowledge necessary to make those distinctions - the distinction between the generic and the idiosyncratic.

Good idiosyncratic scholarship can only spring from a well-developed generic base. Only when we are aware of the norms for a particular phenomenon can we detect how individual cases deviate from the norm. This is one area where cross-disciplinary examinations may be most helpful. My chief concern here is that Hayes has discussed some phenomena which are generic and some which are idiosyncratic and has subsumed all of them under the rubric "Gayspeak." In some cases, viewing these phenomena as "Gayspeak" may

not be the most profitable generalization. As in the earlier example of black studies, Hayes may be "blaming a race for a socioeconomic problem."

The field of speech communication, being a field with interests related to those of Mr. Hayes, and having been an audience for his work, can hopefully provide some insights into Hayes' work. Such an examination may illuminate subsets of Hayes' global view which would be more manageable for future research. In such an effort, the following section will examine each of Hayes' three settings.

"Gayspeak": A View From Across the Hall

In the secret setting, Gayspeak is apparently a restricted language code used to identify other gay people without jeopardizing one's own identity.[6] The other function attributed to secret gayspeak is evading the inquiries of others concerning one's identity and the nature of specific relationships.

From the description, the latter function is simply filled by lying about the nature of those relationships, activities, and attachments. There does not appear to be any peculiar linguistic usage. For example, a college student with a roommate of the opposite sex unbeknownest to his or her parents might employ the same tactics which Hayes claims to be peculiar characteristics of Gayspeak.

It is the former function, identification, which is most interesting. Hayes maintains that: "For gays in a secret setting, the development and maintenance of a code language form a protection against exposure."[7] In other words, Hayes sees this activity as analogous to the highly popularized citizen's band codes — a code specifically created to facilitate communication within an in-group while excluding members of an out-group. In making

this assumption, Hayes ignores the full implications of the term he uses to describe the gay community, "subculture."

Cultures and subcultures have histories. Some histories may be more highly developed and explicated than others, some long and some short, but all cultures and subcultures have continuity in time. To have a history means that the events which constitute this history are defined in terms of people, places, things, and time. Often, these events may have significance to the culture of which they are part, but not to other cultures. More to the point, an event which is significant to a particular subculture may go largely unnoticed by the larger, surrounding culture. In other words, cultures and subcultures have a host of events, including people, places, things, and times which largely attain significance only within that culture or subculture. These events, people, places, and times, have symbolic referents (names) quite aside from any non-externally grounded attempt to create a "secret code." For example, a couple of years ago, there existed in Atlanta, Georgia, a gay bar known as Bayou Landing. The surrounding straight culture was largely unaware of the bar, but it was known by virtually every active gay male in the Southeast. Thus, using Hayes' scenario, two strange men at a straight social gathering, after the preliminary nonverbals, might engage in some conversation. The discussion would be steered around to Atlanta (itself considered a "gay city"), further to places to go there ("Oh, really? Where do you go when you're there?"), and finally someone would drop the name Bayou Landing. Appropriate recognition of the name serves to fill all of the functions Hayes describes.[8]

The same kind of interaction could take place with events (the Stonewall rebellion), people (a local gay person, a national figure like Franklin

Kameny, or a literary figure like Christopher Isherwood), literary works (Teleny, City of Night), gay publications (The Advocate, Christopher Street) or places (San Francisco, Polk Street, The Gold Coast). Hayes' citation of certain cult heros and heroines is a further example of this.[9] Mae West may be a part of the subculture because she has written plays with lesbian themes[10] as much as for any exaggeration "of the stereotyped roles that women play in society."[11] Bette Midler started her career in the gay baths of New York and became a gay idol. Sometimes heros and heroines are part of the gay subculture because of a real or believed participation in that subculture's history. Only female examples have been given here, but the same is true of males.

This cultural view of Gayspeak grants it new dimensions for which Hayes cannot account. The difference in origin between what Hayes presents as a code expressly created for limited communication and what I have presented as a code growing out of a history with significance limited only to an in-group might be expected to create differences in function as well.

In the secret setting, for example, Hayes sees Gayspeak limited almost in contradiction to his definition and certainly more limited than the historical/cultural view would dictate. The question Hayes presents, "May I use Gayspeak in his presence?",[12] is never really raised. If, by its nature, Gayspeak "allows people to hint at their sexual orientation, but never in a way which jeopardizes their ability to pass,"[13] the question Hayes presents is not really important. A better way to conceptualize it is the question 'Would it be profitable (friendship, sexual encounter, etc.) for me to use Gayspeak in his presence?"

In the social setting, none of the questions Hayes presents in the secret setting are relevant. All of those questions are tacitly answered by

participation in the group. The situation is no longer one of identification, resolving doubts, and making contact. Social setting Gayspeak, then, serves a distinctly different function than does secret setting Gayspeak.

Small group theorists give insight into the function of social setting Gayspeak in talking about the social rewards of groups.[14] Extending this notion of rewards, one can begin to understand why a heavily stigmatized group would create social climates which build a defense against the attacks of a larger, surrounding culture. In keeping with current sociological thought on the topic, stigmatized groups socialize in an effort to create an alternative social reality to the one held by the oppressing society of which they are a part.[15]

This effort manifests itself in social setting Gayspeak through the use of "camp." Hayes talks of camp in general terms. Vito Russo describes it particularly as it relates to and reflects the gay subculture:

> Since camp flourishes in urban cliques and is something of a secret code, it has become one of the mainstays of an almost ethnic humor which has been formed for defense purposes over the years. Because camp seeks to comfort and is largely a generous rather than a selfish feeling, it has also operated in a human sense, aiding people in forming images with which they feel comfortable in a hostile culture.[16]

Except for the appearance of certain words believed to be peculiar to the gay subculture, apparently because they describe acts or relationships largely restricted to that group, most of the characteristics Hayes ascribes to the social setting are more properly characteristic of camp. The sexism (use of queen and she), the exaggeration, the trivialization, and the self-deprecation are all qualities of camp.[17] This distinction is important

because camp is neither exclusive to the gay subculture[18] nor universal within that subculture.[19] Gayspeak in the social setting, then, may not be Gayspeak at all, but camp.

If the predominance of camp in the social setting grants insights into the function of social setting Gayspeak, then the marked absence of camp in the radical-activist setting may indicate something about a difference in function. Russo says: "Camp, because it deals only frivolously with the roles we've been assigned and entails no criticism of them, is totally apolitical."[20] The exclusion of, even contempt of, camp in the radical-activist setting rests on this apolitical nature which is dysfunctional to the distinctly political function of the radical-activist.

> We perceive our oppression as a class struggle and our oppressor as white, middle-class, male-dominated, heterosexual society, which has relentlessly persecuted and murdered homosexuals and lesbians since the oppressor has had power.[21]

This excerpt from the introduction to "a collection of the experiences and philosophies of radical lesbians and homosexuals,"[22] illustrates the radical-activist stance, which is anything but a "frivolous" treatment of the gay person's status in America. In fact, implicit in the radical-activist stance is a rejection of such an orientation, often accompanied by a scorn for those who participate in the social setting.[23]

In a like manner, the secret homosexual is the philosophical antithesis to the radical-activist. The idealized version of the radical-activist never worries about his "ability to pass." That type of behavior is injurious to one's goals.[24] With this orientation, use of a restricted language code, as Gayspeak is defined in the secret and social settings, is philosophically

repugnant and counter-productive. Wide scale change in the political-social sphere is not facilitated by communicating with only a few. An elaborated language code is necessary for effective political-social dialectic. Thus, the Gayspeak of the radical-activist is not the Gayspeak of the social or secret settings.

Perhaps the most important statement made by Hayes about the radical-activist Gayspeak is that it "is often indistinguishable from the rhetoric of the general counterculture."[25] This observation is further supported by a notion of an undifferentiated radical-revolutionary rhetoric developed in an article by James Chessbro who specifically includes gay liberation in his study as an example of a cultural revolutionary group.[26]

Here Hayes falls prey to the same criticism raised in connection with the social setting. Hayes is exploring a phenomenon which is not exclusively a product of the gay subculture, nor universal within that subculture. Perhaps his insights are more applicable to radical-revolutionary rhetoric than particularly to a type of Gayspeak. This argument gains added impetus when it is realized that this mode of Gayspeak is so different from, and even critical of, the other modes that it is doubtful that they have anything in common except the fact that all three are used by members of the gay subculture.

Substantively, then, Hayes has made a basic confusion between the generic and the idiosyncratic. In an attempt to tell us something about the unique behaviors of the gay subculture, he has stumbled into larger areas of behavior with no compelling evidence that they are in any way uniquely employed by gay people. Each of the three settings serves a different, sometimes antithetical function, and even on a linguistic level, Hayes fails to provide us with any words or word patterns which have a constant function and usage across settings

which might indeed illuminate something uniquely and universally gay. Rather than a singular Gayspeak which appears in three settings, it seems that a more appropriate conception is $Gayspeak_1$, $Gayspeak_2$, and $Gayspeak_3$, the latter two being subsets of generic behaviors (linguistic and otherwise) known as camp and the rhetoric of the radical-revolutionary, respectively. An artificial association of the three results in a confusing picture of linguistic behavior in the gay subculture with little clear indication of its importance and no clear directive as to where we go from here.

Future Directions for "Gayspeak"

The above analysis is not intended to minimize the contribution of Mr. Hayes' work. In fact, it may be seen as a tribute to its breadth since it seeks to reduce it to more manageable portions. Very little of the substance of Hayes' essay has been contested; it has only been put into a new framework.

Given this body of data as a starting point, where do we go from here? Those who are interested in using gays as data for more generic concerns might expand the notions of camp and radical-revolutionary rhetoric. Consciousness raising is still another, quite new setting in which gays participate but which is also characteristic of women's and men's liberation.[27] Many fields have ignored the gay subculture as a valuable source of data. In an earlier paper, I commented on the paucity of articles in speech communication which acknowledge the existence of the gay community.[28] Those who are interested in pursuing the idiosyncratic approach - creating a distinctive area of gay studies - will indirectly benefit from the encouragement of this generic work.

There are also immediate possibilities for those interested in the idiosyncratic aspects of the gay community. As claimed earlier, this depends on

isolating distinctive qualities of the gay subculture and looking for the effects of those qualities on behavior.

Both on the basis of the foregoing analysis and on outside documentation, the secret setting seems to be the area in which gay people claim their greatest distinctiveness. The issue of identification never materializes for other similarly oppressed groups. Stuart Byron explicates the view that the " . . . particular problem of homosexuality itself - the thing about the state of being gay which distinguishes it from other 'oppressed' conditions . . . is that one can hide one's minority group status: 'staying in the closet' is a phrase that has little application to women or blacks or chicanos."[29]

For students of language and communicative behavior, such isolation suggests questions like the following: How does this ability (for anonymity) affect language use? Does "identification" create unique patterns of interaction? Are there different purposes in making in-group identification (e.g. personal satisfaction of following up "a hunch," feeling of mutual membership in a clandestine community, sexual encounter), and, if so, are they distinguishable from the interaction patterns?

The issue of concealed identity also raises a host of questions concerning different levels of membership and the effect of varying degrees of involvement with the subculture on interaction patterns. The gay community has a remarkable latitude in the degree to which its members identify themselves as such, ranging from the married businessman who stops off at a local tearoom on the way home from work and hustlers who just "let the 'Johns' do them" to the radical-activists who assert their sexuality as an integral part of themselves which cannot be compromised. Ironically, those who least

identify themselves as members of the subculture are those most in need of some unique form of communication. Presenting oneself as gay (or at least as desirous of homosexual contact) is often a necessary prerequisite for identifying others as gay. Only when both the conditions of wanting to identify (i.e., be identified) and not wishing to "jeopardize one's ability to pass" are simultaneously present is there a need for unique modes of interaction. The radical-activist and even many regular participants in the social setting are seldom confronted by both exigences at once.

One potentially fruitful line of pursuit would be the exploration of how non-verbal modes of communication supplement verbal modes, particularly in secret setting identification rituals. Hayes represents the process linguistically through the following exchange:

> Mr. X: You certainly have on a colorful tie!
>
> Mr. Y: Yes, I really like gay apparel.[30]

The problem with this representation is that it lacks context; Hayes gives no hint that any but linguistic cues have been employed here. Martin Hoffman, on the other hand, describes something of the intricate, subtle non-verbal type of behavior which usually predetermines the safety and desirability of any further interaction:

> It is not true that the majority of homosexuals are recognizable on sight by the uninitiated. It is often true, however, that they can recognize each other. This is not because of any distinguishing physical characteristics, but, rather, because when cruising, they engage in behavioral gestures which immediately identify themselves to each other. A large part of cruising is done with the eyes, by means of searching looks of a prolonged nature and through the surveying of the other man's entire body.[31]

This emphasis is confirmed and extended to almost the level of mystique in a letter from a veteran of the gay community to one who was then a young initiate pondering the increasingly apparent ability to recognize and be recognized by other gay men:

> Well, lets [sic] take it from the top. First of all (this is going to be in very plain, subculture language), there is a definite difference in straight and gay males (as well as many females). I don't mean mannerisms. I mean things like attitudes, degree of sensitivity and awareness, perception, etc. This is, of course, not particularly logical nor rational, but is, never the less, my observation. These things are not visible or perceptible to the majority of straights. Of course, there are individuals (straight) who are trained by profession or are for some reason sensitive or perceptive enough (interest being stirred by some sort of contact previous) to "spot" gays (who don't necessarily have outward mannerisms). However, I maintain the old saying that "it takes one to know one." Tacky but true.[32]

The importance of the non-verbal is carried even further when one realizes the pervasiveness of object language cues in the gay subculture. Some of the "artifact displays"[33] are fairly widely known even in the larger heterosexual community - pinky rings, for example, commonly make the wearer suspect. Gay people have a very elaborate set of object language symbols which not only indicate membership in the homosexual community, but also sexual preferences.[34] Wearing exposed key chains is an old indicator of interest in "S&M" (sadism and masochism). Cowboy type handkerchiefs (bandanas) have also been used as indicators of sexual preference. These are worn in

the back pants pocket - one side for "active," and the other for "passive," and around the neck if one will "swing both ways." The color of the kerchief determines the type of sexual activity. What is significant about these object cues in relation to Hayes' paper is that they usually are the basis for and precede any verbal interaction. An excerpt from a short story written by a hustler illustrates the use of behavioral cues and object language:

> The newcomer was dressed the same as I was - black leather jacket, engineer's boots, and - this season's high fashion - light tight chino pants instead of Levis. The Chinos showed you off better if you had anything to show. He had no cap on and his black hair was tumbled. But somehow he didn't seem to me to be a hustler. He wore the "uniform" as if it were his working clothes, and his body sort of settled into it. With the hustlers and the leather crowd you could generally tell it was all a masquerade, a drag, a play-pretend dress-up costume party for itty-bitty boys, with everyone more or less self-conscious.
>
> I slid onto the empty bar-stool next to him. He turned and grinned.
>
> "Hi," he said.
>
> "Hiya," I said, gruff. You just didn't speak to strangers the way he had. You stared and sized 'em up first. This cat must have been real green.[35]

The above evidence is not intended to be conclusive. It hopefully gives some perspective within which the linguistic components can be viewed as part

of a very complex exchange. These examples also give some insight into the extra-linguistic behaviors that are peculiarly gay and will make potential researchers in gay studies aware of possibilities in these areas.

Another area in which work obviously needs doing is non-male, non-white gay communication. Homosexuality more thoroughly transcends other minority memberships than does any other identification. Blacks can be gay; chicanos can be gay; Indians can be gay; women can be gay. In a sense, it can be viewed as an additive process - e.g., a black female homosexual. Most of the work to date deals only with the white, male segment of the subculture. This essay exhibits the same male bias that Hayes notes in his essay.[36] Persons interested in gay studies need to overcome this bias and be aware of the interactions among subsections of a subculture. What unites them? How do traditional divisions on one level and common oppression on another affect interaction?

Related to this problem of minority membership is the lack of role models in the gay community. Unlike blacks, chicanos, Indians, or women who have someone with whom they share their identity and oppression, gay people generally do not have gay parents. In fact, they usually have no role models at all until they have managed to find their own way into the gay community. How does this affect language use and interaction patterns? In fact, how do people learn "Gayspeak" at all? With no role models until they have already penetrated the gay community to some extent, the process of acquisition is itself problematic. These are the kinds of questions and problems to which persons interested in promoting gay studies as an idiosyncratic area of study must devote their attention.

Excitement, Shortsightedness, and a Trip Down the Rabbit Hole

It has been my intention in the above comments to suggest that gay studies must develop a clear understanding of its unique purpose - to inform us of gay people qua gay people. Every eleventh grade poetry class studies Walt Whitman as a poet. Gay studies, on the other hand, have the responsibility of studying Sappho, Whitman, Dickinson, Ginsberg, Auden, etc., as gay poets and the responsibility of establishing that there is validity in doing so or there is no reason to use gayness as a division of study. The issue is, of course, larger than poetry.

The gay subculture provides an excellent example for the necessity of giving such an overview and outlining the research possibilities. With most communicative bodies, including that of the black rights and women's liberation movements, the activity is above board; it is there to be observed by anyone who cares to look. Not so with the gay subculture. Much of the significance of Hayes' remarks lies in the fact that the uninitiated may be involved in a "gay exchange" and never know it. This has a tremendous significance for future research unless we are to leave it all to those who already possess a familiarity with the cues and symbols and hope that they also possess the training and methods.

Essentially the problem I have raised here is one of definition. Especially for a young and burgeoning area, it is important for those developing the area to be somewhat introspective, to actively consider the area's purpose, substance, and province; to define. Earlier I said that my criticisms of Hayes' article would reflect most obviously the infant state of gay studies. I hope that it is now apparent why. Ethnic and minority studies are a relatively new idea. Psychologists hypothesize that such studies are a

result of a new found determination to be ourselves which we achieved through countless repititions of "the gestalt prayer" as we negotiated the sixties. Now that we have decided to be ourselves and to be proud of who we are, we are desperately searching to find out who we are and what it is we are proud of. In the seventies, we are all looking for our roots.

Gay studies is the newest of the new. As an inaugural venture, Mr. Hayes has provided a great service by supplying future scholars with a wealth of data which needs further exploration, and, more than that, by providing a backdrop against which gay studies can begin to find itself. He has given us that grand survey of country we must travel through which Alice sought by standing on her tiptoes. Hayes has further invited the scrutiny of an outside group of students who should be interested in such issues. Hopefully, this cross-disciplinary exchange will be profitable to students in the field of English and language studies, to students in speech and communication, and especially to students in a growing area, gay studies. Without such examination, we may find ourselves calling hills valleys and doing all the running we can do just to stay in the same place.[37]

NOTES

*The author wishes to thank Lea Stewart and Joseph Hayes for readings and comments on this manuscript. Its flaws have been obstinately retained by the author in spite of excellent counsel.

[1]Joseph J. Hayes, "Gayspeak," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 62 (October, 1976), 256-266.

[2]The information in this section is abstracted from the original article.

[3]Ibid., 256.

[4]Ibid., 261.

[5]James Darsey, "Escalation of Agitative Rhetoric: A Case Study of Mattachine Midwest, 1967-1970," a paper presented to the Central States Speech Association, Southfield, Mi., April, 1977. (ED 140 358)

[6]Hayes, 257.

[7]Ibid.

[8]Ibid.

[9]Ibid., 259-260.

[10]For example "The Drag," circa 1927.

[11]Hayes, 260.

[12]Ibid. 257.

[13]Ibid.

[14]For example see: Ernest G. Bormann, Discussion and Group Methods (New York: Harper and Row, 1969), 149-150.

[15]For an explication of the idea of socially created reality see: Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckman, The Social Construction of Reality (Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1967).

[16]Vito Russo, "Camp," The Advocate (May 19, 1976), 17.

[17]Ibid., 17-18.

[18]See: Susan Sontag, "Notes on Camp," Partisan Review, 31 (1964), 515-530. This essay is not concerned with camp as a uniquely gay phenomenon.

[19]Russo notes: "The relation of camp to gay humor is the same as the relation of guilt to being Jewish. It's by reputation only. And just as there are some guilty Portnoys, there are some campy homosexuals." Russo, 17.

[20]Ibid., 18.

[21]Karla Jay, "Foreward," in Karla Jay and Allen Young (eds.), Out of the Closets (New York, Pyramid Books, 1974), 1.

[22]Ibid.

[23]Carl Wittman notes this phenomenon and urges greater solidarity. Carl Wittman, "Refugees from Amerika: A Gay Manifesto," reprinted in Joseph A. McCaffrey (ed.), The Homosexual Dialectic (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972), 162.

[24]Ibid.

[25]Hayes, 261.

[26]James Chesebro, "Rhetorical Strategies of the Radical-Revolutionary," Today's Speech, 20 (Winter, 1972), 37-44.

[27]For an example of an investigation into this setting see: James W. Chesebro, John F. Cragan, and Patricia McCullough, "The Small Group Techniques of the Radical-Revolutionary: A Synthetic Study of Consciousness Raising," Speech Monographs, 40 (June, 1973), 136-146.

[28]Darsey, 1.

[29]Stuart Byron, "The Closet Syndrome," in Jay and Young (eds.), 58.

[30]Hayes, 257.

[31]Martin Hoffman, The Gay World (New York: Basic Books, 1968), 45. Goldhaber also reports a heavy use of non-verbal cues among gays. Gerald Goldhaber, "Gay Talk: Communication Behavior of Male Homosexuals," Gai Saber, 1 (1977), esp. 143, Table 10.

[32]Personal correspondence.

[33]For an understanding of this term see: Mark L. Knapp, Nonverbal Communication in Human Interaction (New York: Holt, Rhinehart, and Winston, 1972), especially pages 79-85.

[34]Hayes refers to the importance of these roles in the subculture from a linguistic standpoint. See: Hayes, 259.

[35]Phil Andros, "Sea Change," reprinted in Stephen Wright (ed.), Different (New York: Bantam Books, 1974), 49.

[36]Hayes, see footnote 3, 256. Goldhaber also excludes women. Goldhaber, 137.

[37]Paraphrased from a conversation between the white queen and Alice in Through the Looking Glass.